

March 20, 1968 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — *Extensions of Remarks*

E 2075

Division Association traveled to New Zealand to participate in ceremonies marking the 25th anniversary of the 2d Marine Division's arrival there during World War II.

New Zealand became a second home for the men of the famed Marine division, and many of the men ended up marrying New Zealand girls. The continuing friendship between the American people and the people of New Zealand was well demonstrated by the tumultuous welcome given President Johnson on his arrival in New Zealand last year.

Mr. Speaker, Frank R. Slivocka, an outstanding citizen of Bayonne, N.J., was one of the heroic veterans of the 2d Marines who went to New Zealand. He carried with him a proclamation expressing the friendship and good wishes of the people of Bayonne to the people of Wellington, New Zealand.

I include at this point a copy of the Bayonne proclamation:

Be it resolved and proclaimed by the mayor and the municipal council of the city of Bayonne, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

"Whereas, The citizens of the City of Bayonne in the County of Hudson and State of New Jersey, United States of America, hold in high esteem the friendship of the people of New Zealand; and

"Whereas, The people of New Zealand have generously given hospitality, warmth and comfort to many of our citizens and men in the service of our country; and

"Whereas, This friendship has been especially bestowed by the people of New Zealand upon members of the United States Marine Corps, our country's proudest and finest fighting men; and

"Whereas, Many members of the Second Marine Division Association are, during the month of February, 1968, returning to New Zealand, the place of their World War II encampment; and

"Whereas, Frank R. Slivocka, a member of the said Second Marine Division Association and honored citizen of the City of Bayonne, is to revisit New Zealand, as aforesaid:

"Now, therefore, be it proclaimed That Frank R. Slivocka is hereby appointed as Ambassador from the City of Bayonne, and he is hereby directed to bring to the Honorable Sir Francis Kitts, Mayor, the Governing Body, and the people of the City of Wellington, New Zealand, this expression of friendship and good wishes on behalf of the people of the City of Bayonne.

file
The Ambassador's Congressional Courier on East-West Trade

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 90th Congress, preoccupied as it is with grave problems confronting us at home and abroad, has been able to accord rather limited consideration to one urgent subject in the field of foreign policy.

This subject is East-West trade and its impact on peace and war, on the current objectives of U.S. policy, and on the entire structure of economic and political relations between the East and the West.

I was delighted, therefore, to find this subject receiving attention from a new publication written for the purpose of acquainting foreign diplomats and other interested parties with the U.S. Congress and the key issues considered by it.

The name of this monthly newsletter is the Ambassador's Congressional Courier. Its editor is one of our foremost distaff reporters in Washington, Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Because I believe that the lead article in the February 1968 issue of the Courier will prove of interest to all Members of Congress, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point.

VIETNAM SLOWS DOWN EAST-WEST TRADE

East-West trade is a mere trickle of total world trade. Yet, belief in the value of free trade in creating international economic stability continues. The desirability of "trade bridges" between Communist and non-Communist nations is accepted by the majority of the Congress.

The "trickle" isn't apt immediately to spurt into a flow of commercial exchange because the Vietnam issue has made many members of the United States Congress interpret "trade bridges" as "trading with the enemy." It was no accident that President Johnson ignored East-West trade in his State of the Union message to Congress.

The Senate and House approved a 5-year extension of the Export-Import Bank and increased the limit on its lending authority from \$9 billion to \$13.5 billion. The conference report, ironing out the differences between the two versions, underscores the desirability of international financing with the restriction that loans not be made to nations furnishing military aid to North Vietnam.

The encouragement of East-West trade is involved . . . directly or indirectly . . . by such legislation as the "Food for Peace" Program (Public Law 480), the Mutual Security Act, the Battle Act, the Export Control Act, and the Foreign Assistance Act.

Is the East anxious to trade with the West?

Yes. Anxious to enlarge their imports from the West, especially capital equipment. But such trade is held back not only by United States export restrictions but also by the limited ability of the Eastern European countries to earn sufficient foreign exchange to pay for those imports which are available from the West.

What is the future of East-West trade?

The future is determined by Government policies of both East and West. For example, if Eastern Europe buys only goods to fill gaps in national production, then no significant expansion is possible. The prospect is brighter, however, if goods made more cheaply elsewhere are encouraged as imports, even if there's some output of the product at home.

Has the East-West trade policy been a success for the United States?

Senator J. William Fulbright (D-Arkansas), Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, contends it is "a proven success." He said in 1965. "Over recent years a number of Eastern European countries have become steadily more independent of the Soviet Union and have entered into increasingly friendly relations with the United States."

In 1967, the United States exported goods and services totaling \$30.7 billion compared to \$26.4 billion in imports. Nonetheless, in the total balance of payments, the United States was in the red at the end of the last year by \$3.5 billion to \$4 billion.

What is the extent of Soviet trade with the United States?

It rose by about \$11 million during 1966, but still lagged behind Soviet trade with Canada, Argentina, and Cuba. Statistics on

Soviet foreign trade reveal 66.5 per cent of all trade in 1966 was done with other Communist nations, but trade with the West was on the rise.

What changes in U.S. legislation would encourage the East to trade more with the West?

Possibly, (1) long term credits, (2) a "most favored nation" status, and (3) more industrial items included on the non-strategic list free of export controls.

The political and psychological benefits of East-West trade could be more important than the economic benefits. Professor Isaiah Frank of Johns Hopkins University contends "a willingness on the part of the United States to loosen up commercial relations with the East could conceivably serve as a prelude to negotiations on broader political issues." Trade discrimination is seen as harmful. Whenever the occasion presents itself, the Soviet Union calls for an end to trade discrimination and for "normalization" of trade relations with all countries. The Soviet Union values acceptance in the world arena.

COURIER QUERIES CHAIRMAN KELLY

The House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe is currently holding hearings on East-West trade. The Courier asked its Chairman, Edna F. Kelly (D-New York), two questions:

1. Should the President be given more discretion in expanding trade between the U.S. and the Iron Curtain countries?

Her answer: "This, essentially, was the recommendation of a public commission headed by Mr. J. Irwin Miller and assigned to study this subject. They felt that by having broader authority in this field, the President would be in a better position to use the leverage of trade in peaceful commodities to obtain concessions and to promote desirable political change in the Communist countries.

"Personally, I have some reservations on this score. We have at present some two dozen laws, administered by six major Government departments and agencies, which deal with East-West trade. Most of them were enacted years ago. We don't really know how effective these laws are in protecting our national interests, or how consistent they are with each other.

"For this reason, the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, is undertaking a thorough review of our laws, regulations and practices relating to East-West trade. As Chairman of the Subcommittee, I have the responsibility for conducting these hearings. And one of the questions I definitely want answered in these hearings is the one you asked: namely, should the Congress give the President any additional authority in this field?

"I may add that I am very much concerned about the rapid increase in trade between Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and our allies in Western Europe on the other. In 1967, the volume of trade between our NATO allies and Eastern Europe went over the \$7 billion mark. During the same year, U.S. exports to Communist countries amounted to less than \$250 million. The difference here is tremendous—both in quantity and quality. Our NATO allies are moving ahead in trading with the Communist countries—perhaps too far and too fast. They are supplying the Communist countries with advanced technology. This can have very far-reaching ramifications. I certainly would not favor any relaxation of controls on modern industrial technology and strategic items. If anything, we may need to strengthen these controls."

2. Would you exclude some Iron Curtain countries, and if so, why?

"I don't think that we should treat all of those countries the same way. For example, I believe that our embargo on trade with Red

China, North Korea, North Vietnam and Cuba should be maintained. On the other hand, some of the Eastern European countries are beginning to liberalize their internal systems and to move gradually toward the West. In those cases, I feel that we ought to use our trade policy to reduce their dependence on Moscow and on some of their neighbors. We ought to have a flexible approach which would help to advance our national objectives, and to promote our national security."

Critics of Hangings in Rhodesia Denounced

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

MR. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article by James J. Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Star last night.

I continue to be amazed at the constant effort by mature people and mature countries to destroy the country of Rhodesia, the latest tirade being directed at the Ian Smith government, because it had the audacity to execute some murdering criminals. It is constantly pointed out that the Queen had commuted the criminals' sentences to life imprisonment. Since the Unilateral Declaration of Independence, the Queen has no more authority over the internal affairs of Rhodesia than did the King of England have over the internal affairs of the United States of America after independence. In fact, the Queen did not have this power even before the Unilateral Declaration of Independence.

The leftwing press and the Commie-leaning liberals constantly refer to these murdering criminals as "freedom fighters," when, in fact, they were guilty of the most heinous crimes that man can perpetrate upon his fellow man.

The article follows:

CRITICS OF HANGINGS IN RHODESIA DENOUNCED
(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Rhodesia has been suffering lately from a very bad press: The State Department denies a visa to Prime Minister Ian Smith. The Virginia House of Delegates shouts down a resolution of support for Rhodesia. Back in Salisbury, right-wing pressures toward apartheid grow more intense. Defying Queen, Pope, and world opinion, the Smith regime proceeds with the hanging of five "freedom fighters."

At the United Nations, the Afro-Asian bloc demands new measures against Rhodesia, more punitive than the present sanctions. A lead article in the prestigious American Journal of International Law defends the sanctions: the theory of the authors, one of them a Yale professor, is that Rhodesia has offended the "shared sensitivities" of her neighbors, and thus created an actionable threat to the peace. The fury is especially intense in England, where members of Commons denounce Ian Smith as "a murderer."

It is true enough that the Rhodesian government, struggling for survival in a hostile world, has taken some actions in recent months that American friends must regret. Laws relating to housing and to segregation of public parks are steps backward, not forward. The Smith government has not im-

peded the registration of black voters, but it has done little to encourage the African franchise; the number of registered blacks is half what it was three years ago.

But the current uproar, touched off by the five hangings, ought to be denounced as blatant hypocrisy on the part of most of those who are whooping it up. Macaulay once remarked that he knew of no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodical fits of morality. This current fit qualifies. And no spectacle in Africa is more contemptible than the criticism hurled at Rhodesia by despotic black regimes which are themselves guilty of bloody crimes and the repression of political freedoms.

It is said that the five condemned men were "freedom fighters." Let us see how they fought for freedom.

James Ndhlamini and Victor Mlambo were members of a terrorist group known as the Crocodile Gang. They threw a block of trees across a country road. When a white farmer named Oberholzer came along, with his wife and small daughter in the car, they fell upon them with knives and stones. As he was dying at the steering wheel, they attempted to set the car on fire in an effort to kill the woman and child. This was a fight for freedom?

Duly Shadreck waylaid an elderly black man at midnight, killed him with an axe, and robbed him of seven shillings. Noble, was it not?

Francis Chimsoro Risa and Takauyare Jeremiah stole into a tribal hut where a sub-chief named Nedewedzo was sleeping with his wife. They tore off most of his head with a shotgun blast. It seems an odd exercise in self-determination.

For these brutal murders, the five defendants were brought to trial in the High Court of Rhodesia. They had the assistance of counsel. In each case, a judge and two "assessors," under the Rhodesian system, found them guilty without extenuating circumstance. The death sentences followed. These were sustained on appellate review.

Why the outcry? In terms of moral principle, those who deplore the death penalty may deplore its imposition anywhere. But as a matter of law, these punishments were peculiarly the business of Rhodesia. Pietistic Americans might restrain themselves long enough to acknowledge that 3,857 executions were carried out in their own United States between 1930 and 1966.

It is said that Rhodesia "defied the Queen." But the Queen in this affair was no more than a pretty figurehead; the clemency decree came from the Wilson government, which had no authority even under the pre-independence Rhodesian constitution of 1961, to exercise the prerogative of mercy. The incident was patently trumped up. It is a fair surmise that Wilson's object was to divert the British public from troubles at home by fabricating some vicarious outrage abroad.

One expects opportunism from the Communists and hypocrisy from the Afro-Asian bloc. One has learned to expect anything from Harold Wilson. But it is a sad commentary on the United States, which once also proclaimed its independence from the British crown, to see our own people join in the calamity howling against Rhodesia now heard across the land.

The "Pueblo": How Long, Mr. President?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

MR. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 58th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Vocational Education: Keystone to Solving Unrest in America's Cities

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 20, 1968

MR. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was my privilege to address the Illinois Vocational Association in Chicago, Ill., to discuss the potential of vocational education in this country today.

As chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education here in the House, which is now hearing testimony on the Partnership for Learning and Earning Act of 1968, I cannot overemphasize the importance of readying our students for occupational challenges following high school.

The need is evident and overwhelming. I submit, for the review of my colleagues, the text of my address to the Illinois Vocational Association, with the hope that we, as legislators, may be able to initiate the necessary measures in Congress to meet this challenge.

The text of my remarks follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—KEYSTONE TO SOLVING UNREST IN AMERICA'S CITIES
(Remarks of the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI before the Illinois Vocational Association, Sherman House, Chicago, Ill., March 7, 1968)

As we assemble here this evening to discuss vocational education, there is a pall of fear sweeping across America—fear of another long hot summer with millions of Americans wondering how extensive the damage will be this time.

There isn't a commentator or analyst who doesn't remind us of the devastation to come.

We assemble here in the wake of the report issued by the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders—better known as the Riot Commission.

Never before in the history of this nation—or for that matter, any nation—have a people undergone so intensive a process of self-analysis to determine what is wrong within our Republic; what is tearing this nation apart; are we, indeed, about to admit that free men cannot mold their own destiny.

There are no simple solutions, but this evening I should like to discuss with you some of my own observations on where this nation has gone wrong.

Last December, at the Convention of the American Vocational Association in Cleveland, I pointed out that by 1972 our nation will be in a trillion dollar economy and that the involvement of our nation in occupational training will approach \$15 billion a year by 1980.

We are now expecting to hit an \$850 billion Gross National Product by July 1 of this year. Yet only yesterday morning the very distinguished Superintendent of Public Instruction in the City of Cleveland, Dr. Briggs, testified before my Committee that 58% of out-of-school inner-city youth are unemployed.

Statistics after statistics tell us that in this eighth consecutive year of prosperity this nation continues to suffer almost 4,000,000 people unemployed and the largest single group of unemployed in this country are the young people.

I submit to you this evening that as this nation probes for an answer to rioting in the streets we take a sober look at the failure of American education.

It is ironic that many of you in this assembly as vocational educators have warned about this crisis for many years, but they didn't listen to you.